

AMENDMENT
Application No.: 10/696,618
Attorney Docket No.: EI-7607

REMARKS

Applicant submits this response to the Office Action mailed March 23, 2006. Initially, with respect to the specification, Applicant is not aware of any errors. Applicant would be pleased to correct any errors which the Examiner may become aware of.

Pursuant to the foregoing amendments, the claims have been directed more specifically to the recent, advanced emissions control strategies that are discussed in the Background of the present application on page 3 thereof. Advanced emissions control systems are specifically identified at the top of page 6 of the application including, for example, exhaust gas recirculation systems. Further, the narrowing of claims 12 and 26 to be limited to direct injection gasoline engines further focuses the currently claimed invention on modern technology.

At present, claims 1-8, 12-22 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorer. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-17, 20-24 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Henderson. Finally, claims 11 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Henderson in view of Kaneko. In view of the foregoing amendments, and for one or more of the following reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections are traversed.

Applicant has carefully studied all of the cited Dorer, Henderson and Kaneko references. Nowhere in those references is there any disclosure of an advanced emissions control system, for example, an exhaust gas recirculation system, used in connection with a spark ignition engine. Still further, nowhere is there disclosed a direct injection gasoline engine. This failure of disclosure in the prior art references is not surprising, because the now-claimed technologies are relatively new. They would not have been known or in common use at the time of any of the cited references. Further, as noted in the background section of the present application, the combustion chamber deposit flaking problem has only recently been seen with the introduction of advanced emissions control systems. In other words, the modern technology engines experience this harmful combustion chamber deposit flaking. Older technology engines, for instance, carbureted engines, did not experience the same degree of combustion chamber deposit flaking as the modern engines such as direct injection gasoline engines and spark ignition engines having advanced ignitions controls.

AMENDMENT
Application No.: 10/696,618
Attorney Docket No.: EI-7607


In view of the foregoing lack of disclosure or teaching in the cited references, Applicant submits that the present application, as narrowed in the foregoing amendments, is now in condition for allowance. The obviousness rejections are traversed. There is no teaching or other suggestion of the claimed invention. The claimed invention is no mere discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, because the methods would not and could not have been practiced at the time of the cited references. The problem did not exist in the prior art. Therefore, the rejections are traversed.

In view of the foregoing Amendment, and for one or more of the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that all of the claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. Favorable action is requested hereon.

FEES

It is believed that there are no fees associated with this filing. However, in the event that this is incorrect, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 05-1372.

Respectfully submitted,



Dennis H. Rainear, Reg. No. 32,486

330 South Fourth Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219
Phone: (804) 788-5516
FAX: (804) 788-5519
E-Mail: Dennis.Rainear@Newmarket.com

Date: June 20, 2006